



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/538,173

08/07/2006

Eran Fine

30063

1754

67801

7590

02/09/2009

MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC.

P.O. BOX 16446

ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

ROJAS, OMAR R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2874

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/09/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/538,173	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FINE, ERAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> OMAR ROJAS	<b>Art Unit</b> 2874	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) OMAR ROJAS. (3) Eran Naftali.

(2) Martin D. Moynihan. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 90 and 130.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 2004/0196648 and US 6,528,755.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Naftali argued that the references were not combinable and that the '648 Publication to Franklin was directed to a tubular waveguide. Mr. Naftali argued that it would not have been obvious to modify Franklin to use a flexible waveguide sheet. The examiner agreed and said he would withdraw the previous 103 rejection. The examiner further stated that he would need time to update the search and review new claim 130 more closely.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Omar Rojas/ Examiner, Art Unit 2874	
---	--